

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 2-15 and 17-21 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants cancel Claim 1 and amend Claims 2-9, 17, 18 and 20.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that Claims 13-15 are allowed, and that Claims 4 and 7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8-11, and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Dyke et al. (U.S. 6,657,130). Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-12, and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chakravorty (U.S. 6,970,362). Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Dyke et al. in view of Chakravorty. Claims 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Dyke et al. in view of Ehman et al. (6,021,050). Claim 1 has been canceled. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8-12, and 17-21.

Allowable Claims 4 and 7 have been amended to be in independent form including all of the features of Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 4 and 7 are allowable.

Claim 5 has been amended to recite:

A laminated electronic component comprising:  
a laminated block including a plurality of electrically insulating layers and an internal conductor film disposed between the insulating layers laminated together in a thickness direction of said laminated block;  
an external conductor film disposed on an exposed surface of said laminated block; and  
an additional conductor film which is at the same electric potential as said external conductor film and which is arranged along a specific interface between the insulating layers such that said additional conductor film faces said external conductor film; wherein  
said insulating layers are formed of ceramic material;  
**the area of said additional conductor film is greater than or equivalent to the area of said external conductor film, and is arranged such that said additional conductor film covers said**

**external conductor film therein when viewed from above or below;  
and  
the external conductor film defines one of a die bonding  
surface and a land for mounting.**

With the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in Applicants' Claim 5, including the features of "the area of said additional conductor film is greater than or equivalent to the area of said external conductor film, and is arranged such that said additional conductor film covers said external conductor film therein when viewed from above or below" and "the external conductor film defines one of a die bonding surface and a land for mounting," even if cracks occur in the insulating layer adjacent to the external conductor film, an electric field is not generated between the external conductor film and the additional conductor film since they are at the same potential, thereby preventing the occurrence of migration of metal materials therebetween. As a result, failures, such as short-circuiting and leakage, in the laminated electronic component are reliably prevented (see, for example, the first full paragraph on page 5 of the originally filed specification).

The Examiner alleged that each of Van Dyke et al. and Chakravorty teaches all of the features recited in Claims 1 and 5. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In contrast to Applicants' Claim 5, neither Van Dyke et al. nor Chakravorty teaches or suggests anything at all about the specific areas of the external conductor film and the additional conductor film, and certainly fails to teach or suggest the feature of "the area of said additional conductor film is greater than or equivalent to the area of said external conductor film, and is arranged such that said additional conductor film covers said external conductor film therein when viewed from above or below" as recited in Applicants' Claim 5.

It appears that the Examiner is relying on Fig. 2A of Van Dyke et al. and Fig. 3 of Chakravorty to allegedly teach this feature. However, the Examiner is reminded that when a reference does not disclose that the drawings are to scale and is silent as to dimensions, arguments based on measurement of the drawing features are of little

Serial No. 10/633,701  
August 3, 2006  
Reply to the Office Action dated March 6, 2006  
Page 9 of 10

value. See *Hockerson-Halberstadt, Inc. v. Avia Group Int'l*, 222 F.3d 951, 956, 55 USPQ2d 1487, 1491 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (The disclosure gave no indication that the drawings were drawn to scale. "[I]t is well established that patent drawings do not define the precise proportions of the elements and may not be relied on to show particular sizes if the specification is completely silent on the issue.").

Since Van Dyke et al. and Chakravorty are completely silent with respect to the dimensions (i.e., the areas) of the external conductor film and the additional conductor film, Applicants respectfully submit that Fig. 2A of Van Dyke et al. and Fig. 3 of Chakravorty cannot be relied upon to teach or suggest the feature of "the area of said additional conductor film is greater than or equivalent to the area of said external conductor film, and is arranged such that said additional conductor film covers said external conductor film therein when viewed from above or below" as recited in Applicants' Claim 5.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Van Dyke et al. and over Chakravorty.

The Examiner relied upon Ehman et al. to allegedly cure deficiencies of Van Dyke et al. However, Ehman et al. fails to teach or suggest the feature of "the area of said additional conductor film is greater than or equivalent to the area of said external conductor film, and is arranged such that said additional conductor film covers said external conductor film therein when viewed from above or below" as recited in Applicants' Claim 5. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Ehman et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Van Dyke et al. described above.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Van Dyke et al., Chakravorty, and Ehman et al., applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in Applicants' Claim 5.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 4, 5, and 7 are allowable. Claims 2, 3, 6, 8-12, and 17-21 depend upon Claim 5, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that Claim 5 is allowable.

Serial No. 10/633,701  
August 3, 2006  
Reply to the Office Action dated March 6, 2006  
Page 10 of 10

In addition, Claims 13-15 are allowable as indicated by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a Two-Month Extension of Time, extending to August 7, 2006 (August 6, 2006 falls on a Sunday), the period for response to the Office Action dated March 6, 2006.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 3, 2006

/Christopher A. Bennett #46,710/  
Attorneys for Applicants

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett  
Registration No. 46,710

Stephen R. Funk  
Registration No. 57,751

**KEATING & BENNETT, LLP**  
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 850  
Tyson's Corner, VA 22102  
Telephone: (703) 637-1480  
Facsimile: (703) 637-1499